



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

for a Copper Age preceding the Bronze are carefully examined and found wanting. Quite as futile are attempts to find a very ancient Iron Age as compared with Bronze. In this connection Dr Walter Hough makes the suggestion that in his explorations in Arizona he found that the confined heat in the potters' kilns has been sufficient to fuse and distort the clay and produce vitreous slag. The heating of pit ovens for roasting roots was another device for intensifying heat, and pit furnaces were well known to ancient bronze-workers. However the combination of copper and tin may have been brought about, it was not a sudden discovery. Mr Read follows this earliest metallurgy throughout Britain, France, Germany, Switzerland, Austria-Hungary, Denmark, the Russian Empire, Italy, Spain, Egypt and the eastern Mediterranean, Mesopotamia, Persia, and China, as illustrated in the marvelous collections of the British Museum, in myriad forms of tools and weapons, vessels and utensils, jewelry and insignia, trappings and vehicles. In the introductory chapter, after reviewing the first appearance of metals in human industry, Mr Read takes up the ethnology of ancient peoples inhabiting those parts of the world with which the British Isles and the adjacent countries are most intimately connected. After reviewing the Aryan question and deciding upon Ripley's Alpine race as the one that forced the Aryan language upon the aboriginal inhabitants of Europe, the author examines the graves and their contents for evidence, with the following conclusions: Bronze was introduced into the southern counties of England from the continent; in the mounds only the simplest tools and weapons occur; the Phœnicians probably obtained tin from Cornwall 1500-1200 B. C.; 1800 B. C. is a probable date for the beginning of bronze in Great Britain and Ireland. At the close of the introduction Mr Read presents an interesting example of bringing historical chronology and early culture history together in the establishment of probable dates. The bulk of the volume is devoted to the description and illustration of specimens in the cases.

O. T. MASON.

Comparative Philology. A Comparison between Semitic and American Languages with a Map and Illustrations. By ARNOLD M. LEESEBERG, *Dr. Juris*. Leyden, 1903. Late E. J. Brill. 8°, pp. i-viii, 1-83.

In these days of exact philological science, it is difficult to understand how such a work as this was permitted to see the light. The title alone would be sufficient to make competent philologists look askance, but when the contents are carefully examined, the reader is lost in won-

der that a man trained in an exact branch of learning (a doctor juris!) should venture to bring forward such wild comparisons as Dr Leesberg has done. The book deserves notice only as a philological *curiosum*.

In his introduction (pages 1-15) the author gives a rambling and pitifully inadequate account of the Colla (formally known as Aymará), Khetsua, Chiapanec, Mayan, Taino-Carib, and Chukchee languages, devoting but a single page to each. He dismisses the idioms of North America with the remark (page 15): "As to North America, different languages have been considered, but race similarities are to be found, the many migrations through the immense territories not having favoured lasting settlements. It is well known that all these tribes originated in Central America, moving northward." This last statement is quite in keeping with the general tone of the book.

It is in his comparative dictionary, however, that the author really exceeds all canons of true linguistic science. He discusses here about nine hundred words representing some twelve hundred Semitic compounds, comparing American words selected at random, chiefly from six distinct languages, with supposed Hebrew-Aramaic equivalents. The utter futility of any such attempts to connect American with Asiatic languages will be seen from the following examples, which really need little comment: On page 22 he compares Khetsua *ñañuk*, Chiapanec *nasungi*, with Aramaic *īanûk(ā)*, 'baby.' He compares the Colla *kori*, Khetsua *cori*, with Hebrew *xārûç*, 'gold'; the Taino-Carib *bana*, *bauna*, with Hebrew *binīān*, 'building,' 'house.' These examples I have purposely chosen because there is a faint (of course accidental) similarity between some of the words. When, however, we compare the following, we see how far the author has wandered afield in his vain search for word similarities: Colla *payla*, Khetsua *paylla*, Hebrew *pûr*, 'pot' (?); does he mean the stem from which comes *p'êr*, 'turban'? Colla *sarcha-hata*, Khetsua *chura*, Hebrew *zārāk*, *īārâ*, 'reject'?¹ I think these examples are sufficient to demonstrate the method of the work.

The author's chief conclusions (page 83) are as sadly amusing as are the rest of his statements. I. "The unity of the American peoples may be demonstrated by their languages." II. "The Maya, Colla and Khetsua languages . . . show a greater resemblance with the Semitic ones than with any other old linguistic family."

It is hardly necessary to point out that sporadic resemblances in vocabulary between languages belonging to groups far apart from each other are no evidence whatever as to interrelationship, even when these

¹ Hebrew *zārāk* and *īārâ* = 'scatter' and 'sprinkle', never 'reject.'

resemblances are really striking and not forced, as is the case with so many of those cited by Dr Leesberg. *À propos* of this, why did he not cite the Khetsua first personal pronoun *ñoka* 'I,' as being cognate with the Hebrew *anoki*? Here was a good opportunity lost! Sporadic similarities of this sort are not uncommon. Thus we have Mandshu *shun* = Eng. *sun*! Mandshu *sengi* = Latin *sanguis* 'blood'; Khetsua *inti* 'sun'; *munay* 'love'; *veypul* 'great' = Sanscrit *indra*, *manyu*, *vipula*.¹ In the same way there are occasional accidental resemblances between Hebrew and Celtic. Thus, Irish *leaca* 'cheek,' Hebrew *l'xi* 'jawbone'! All this proves nothing at all, because sound etymology has little to do with sound itself, but with certain fixed laws which must be carefully studied in every individual language and language-group. Even the most casual observer of the Khetsua postpositional polysynthetic noun system must be convinced at once that this idiom is radically different from the prepositional inflexional Semitic noun. Compare the following Khetsua paradigm:

Nom. *hatun rumi* 'big stone' (*hatun* 'big' *rumi* 'stone').

Gen. *hatun rumij*.

Dat. *hatun rumipaj*.

Acc. *hatun rumita*.

Illat. *hatun rumiman*.

Ablat. *hatun rumimanta*.²

Dr Leesberg's book is only another futile attempt to show a race relationship between the American Indians and the ancient Hebrews, although he disclaims the theory that the American aborigines were the Ten Lost Tribes. It is a pity that the author ever undertook such a task without first seeking competent philological advice. Finally, it may be stated that his English throughout the entire work is nearly as faulty as are his philological conclusions.

J. DYNELEY PRINCE.

Metallic Ornaments of the New York Indians. By WILLIAM M. BEAUCHAMP. (Bulletin of the New York State Museum, No. 73. Archeology, No. 8.) Albany: 1903. 8°, 111 pp., 36 pl., 414 figures.

Dr Beauchamp gives in this, the latest of his publications, numerous figures of ornaments made from brass, iron, copper, bronze, pewter, and silver. The different types illustrated comprise a variety of objects, which afford ample materials for speculation concerning fashions in jewelry among the American Indians after first contact with the whites during the

¹ Compare Humboldt, *Travels*, Eng. transl., I, p. 322, and Sayce, *Science of Language*, I, pp. 148-9.

² Compare Middendorf, *Die Keshua Sprache*, p. 59.